

SEMARIA GASS,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
NGOC NGUYEN, CHRISTY HUONG,  
VI TRUONG, and TRAM NDO,  
  
Defendants.

The district court may assign dispositive pretrial matters pending before the

court to a magistrate judge for “proposed findings of fact and recommendations.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The Federal Magistrate Act provides that a district court “shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” Id. § 636(b)(1); Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

### III. DISCUSSION

As no objection to the M&R has been made, the parties have waived their right to de novo review of any issues covered in the M&R. After review of the M&R and the entire record, the Court determines that the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge to grant Nguyen’s and Ndo’s motions to dismiss is fully consistent with and supported by current law. Therefore, the Court adopts the M&R.

### IV. CONCLUSION

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that:

1. The Magistrate Judge’s M&R, (Doc. No. 27), is **ADOPTED**; and
2. Nguyen’s and Ndo’s motions to dismiss, (Doc. Nos. 7 & 10), are **GRANTED**, and Nguyen and Ndo are dismissed from this action.

Signed: March 6, 2020

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert J. Conrad, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

Robert J. Conrad, Jr.  
United States District Judge

